

20th March 1923]

[Mr. K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu]

attached to a workshop.* Comparing the work that is now going on in this institute and the instructions given in the Industrial Commission Report, my hon. friend will notice that we are following exactly on the lines laid down by the Industrial Commission.

“As for the Government Order, I may say that it was passed some five or six months prior to my taking charge of the portfolio; but I am not going to give the go-by to my predecessors and I am willing to abide by those orders and say that they have proceeded on right lines.”

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—“I have to say a few words in reply to the remarks made by the hon. the Minister and the Director of Industries. At the outset, I have to say that the proportion of workmen to apprentices in an institution of this kind is far too great. It is not necessary to have one workman for every apprentice. Surely, one skilled mechanic can be expected to teach two or three boys.

“Then as to the necessity of a workshop, if, as contended by the Director of Industries, it is necessary to have a workshop in order to teach the apprentices, why can we not run the concern on a profitable basis? The running charges come to about Rs. 1,700 a month and there are 80 apprentices in all. To run the workshop on a profitable basis, the customers may be charged with a sum sufficient to cover the working expenses and the cost of the material and leave a profit in addition. If that is not done, the institute is a failure. On this matter, I should like to take the sense of the House and I therefore press my motion.”

The motion was put and lost.

III

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1922-23.

Grant I.

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“Sir, I beg to move—

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 4.53 lakhs under Land Revenue Department.

Sir, the details in respect of this supplementary grant and the reasons justifying every one of the items which are included in this grant will be found at page 3 under the heading ‘detailed memoranda.’ If hon. Members wish to have any further information, I should be glad to supply them with such information.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—“Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the supplemental demand for Rs. 4.53 lakhs under Land Revenue Department by Rs. 100.

Sir, we in this House are very often accustomed to be asked to vote for supplementary grants. To-day we have got a long list of supplementary grants. I must really thank the hon. the Finance Member for supplying us with a memorandum explaining the various items that comprise the demands. The hon. the Finance Member has also explained the procedure that is followed in England and the procedure that we are following here. He is kind enough to note that we in this House pass in a debate of ten days the whole of our estimate the discussion of which in the House of Commons is spread over the months from March to August. We know how difficult it was for us to avoid discussion and in spite of repeated requests to you, Sir,

[Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

[20th March 1923]

Grant I—cont.

and the hon. the Deputy President, demands were put to the House and voted upon without any further extension of time and the House was not given any opportunity of fully discussing certain important demands such as the police, etc.

"Secondly, I wish to bring to the notice of the House that in this long list of demands covering a sum of nearly 17 lakhs, we have for the Transferred Department only a sum of Rs. 80,000 and the rest is for the Reserved Department. This does not augur well for the Transferred Department inasmuch as all the saving shown in the explanatory memorandum appears to have been effected in the Transferred Department. An account of all the saving is given at page 8 of the memorandum.

"Then, Sir, the reason why I have tabled this motion is that I want to discuss the utter neglect of the claims of Oriyas in appointments made in the Land Revenue Department. I have also intimated to the hon. the Revenue Member that I was going to raise the question of representation of Oriyas in the Land Revenue Department."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I ask your ruling, Sir, as to whether the hon. Member is in order in raising the question of representation of Oriyas on a motion asking for a supplementary grant? The demand for a supplementary grant is purely an account matter, and I do not think it is relevant to raise the question of representation of Oriyas."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member is in order because he raises the question of the representation of Oriyas in the Land Revenue Department for which a supplementary grant is asked for."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"It is a pity, Sir, that in this country importance is attached to appointments in public service. The orders recently passed by the Government have made matters worse because instead of accepting the principle of proportional representation, they have accepted the principle of communal representation. Had this not transgressed proper limits, I for one would not have cared to attach any importance whatsoever to these things. The appointment of Oriyas in the public services has given a great cause of complaint in the quarters of this Presidency where the Oriyas inhabit for the most part. The utter neglect of the claims of the Oriyas has led to serious administrative difficulties. The issue of summons, the recording of evidence in courts and various other things have brought up a crop of trouble to the Oriyas. The leading men of the community approached the Government as early as 1907 and the result was that the Government was pleased to issue an Order No. 2957, dated 29th October 1907, fixing the percentage of Oriyas or Oriya-knowing people. That order was not properly worked and a further representation on this matter made the Government pass another Order No. 437, dated 1st December 1918, wherein it was laid down that even in the absence of passed Oriyas, unpassed Oriya candidates might be taken up in the public services. After that another Government Order was passed, namely, G.O. No. 1935, dated 28th August 1919, in which it was laid down that no candidate should be selected or appointed unless he is able to read and write Oriya manuscripts with fair fluency and correctness. The reason for passing this Government Order is clear. The fact is that many people not knowing a word of Oriya were appointed to the serious inconvenience of the public that had to resort to courts and offices.

20th March 1923] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

• *Grant I—cont.*

“Then came the communal Government Order of August 1922 laying down preferential treatment for the non-Brahmans.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“May I ask the hon. Member to quote correctly?”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—“I have not got a copy of the Government Order here with me; but I know that order was passed with a view to give representation to the different non-Brahman communities in this province. It is a well-known fact that the Oriyas have a long-standing grievance and that has not been attended to till now. In order to show clearly the enormous grievance of the Oriyas, I wish to quote certain figures to the House. Out of six tahsildars and nine deputy tahsildars in the Ganjam district there is only one Oriya deputy tahsildar, and that on probation. Out of the appointments in the subordinate service in the Ganjam district on a salary above Rs. 100, not a single officer is an Oriya, and even in the subordinate service below Rs. 100, we have very few Oriyas; I do not think it will exceed 25 per cent.

5-30 p.m. “Taking the Presidency figures into consideration, out of 123 deputy collectors, we have got only two deputy collectors who were confirmed, and one is still a probationer. That does not even work up to 2½ per cent of the appointments. Out of twenty-five sarishtadars carrying a salary of over Rs. 200, we have none. Besides, there is an army of officials, both in the subordinate and in the higher services in the Secretariat and in the Board of Revenue, wherein no Oriya representation has been made. In these circumstances, Government should give preferential treatment to Oriyas in the matter of appointment. This subject was raised by the Oriya community when His Excellency the Governor visited Berhampur. The question was then discussed at length, and the deputationists represented to His Excellency that, while there were many available hands who could discharge their duties properly, the claims of the Oriyas did not receive proper treatment at the hands of the officials. In these circumstances, I would request the hon. Member for Revenue to take due note of these facts and direct the deputy collectors to see that the Government Orders are put into operation. With these few words, Sir, I beg to make my motion.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“Sir, the hon. Member began by expressing, if I understood him correctly, a disapproval of the methods pursued in the matter of reservation of places to meet communal interests. Nevertheless, inasmuch as he thinks that Government have been taking some interest with a view to meet the demands of communities which are not well represented in the public services, he draws the attention of the Government to the fact that the Oriyas, as a community, are not sufficiently represented in the public service. But he has at the same time been good enough to tell the House the various attempts made by the Government by the issue of orders to their officers to safeguard the interests of the Oriya community. He has given us certain figures which from his own standpoint are discouraging so far as his community is concerned. I am not in a position now, Sir, to judge why, if there are competent Oriyas available who can be appointed to certain posts in the Revenue Department, their claims have not been considered. I have always been under the impression that the local officers to whom orders

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

[20th March 1923]

Grant I—cont.

of Government are issued loyally carry out those orders provided it is possible for them to do so, and I have not the least doubt, Sir, that if qualified Oriyas are available in those districts where their services can be utilized—and I take it that Ganjam district will be the one where their services can more profitably be utilized—the local officials would be only too glad to consider the claims of this community. Beyond assuring my hon. friend opposite that I have listened with interest to the facts which he has brought to my notice, and that I shall look into the matter and see if there is any further remedy which can be applied, I am not able to say anything more."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya:—"Sir, we have no quarrel with the Government, but the difficulty is that the Government Orders are observed more in their breach than in their observance. As for my saying that I am against representation of communities in public services, I think the hon. the Revenue Member has misunderstood me. What I said was that I am against the principle of communal representation in service, but that I certainly like proportional representation of different communities—a policy which has been accepted by other provincial administrations. Therefore, I believe that the hon. the Revenue Member will give his due consideration to the claims of this community, and I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"May I say one word, Sir?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am first putting to the House that this grant of 4.53 lakhs be given to the Government and then the hon. Member can speak upon that by way of opposition to the grant if he has got any reasons to urge against it. That will be an opportune time for him to speak if he has got anything to say. The hon. Member can now speak."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Thank you, Sir. I shall say one word with reference to this grant, not by way of opposition, but for the purpose of eliciting a piece of information from my hon. friend the Revenue Member."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The Revenue Member may not speak again."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Then I shall speak opposing this grant, Sir. The hon. Member has stated at page 3 of his memorandum that he has distributed this grant among various items. There are four figures given there. The first is a sum of Rs. 1,59,300. I do not object to that at all. The explanation given with reference to that is satisfactory. Then there are two other figures, one of Rs. 20,000 and another of Rs. 20,152. To those also I do not object. But as to the other item, which is the biggest of all the items, viz., Rs. 3,13,900, the explanation given is to my mind not satisfactory. It is under 26-D. Police—Village Police—Village talaiyaris. The explanation is this:

The Board has failed to make as large reductions in the number of talaiyaris during the year as were expected.

I cannot understand why the Board has failed to make this. It is a very large amount and certainly it must have been possible for the Board to make some substantial reductions therein. As proper explanation has not been given regarding it, I wish to oppose this grant at the present stage."

20th March 1923]

Grant I—cont.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, the only observation that I have to make is that this is the first of a series of demands that have been made by the Government, and the total of these comes to about 17 lakhs. That being the case, it is certainly open to the hon. Members to complain that these large demands for supplementary grants are brought up just at the end of the year. The hon. the Finance Member anticipating that some objection would be taken, has attempted to give some explanation in his explanatory note which is appended to this statement. But whatever the explanation may be, it seems to me, Sir, that some serious effort should be made to put an end to this state of affairs. If the hon. Member were to ask us to vote for this 17 lakhs of rupees, say, in half an hour at the end of the Budget discussion now extending over eight days, it is certainly calling too much upon our—may I say—patience and perseverance in the discharge of public duty. At the same time there is no further use in discussing these items in detail. Apparently the hon. Member is going to tell us that the whole of this amount has been already spent by the heads of Departments, and it will certainly serve no good purpose now to examine these grants in detail and to offer criticisms thereon. So, while complaining that these grants might have been brought up much earlier and subjected to the scrutiny of the House, I should advise hon. Members not to raise either questions of policy or of details on these various motions, because it seems to me that it will really be a futile discussion now at the end of a hard day's work. That does not mean that the hon. the Finance Member and his colleagues can come to us now and ask for a grant of 17 lakhs on a statement which my hon. friend the Finance Member has given. I certainly think that he has given some details of this expenditure and it is quite possible also to contend that some of these are necessary and unavoidable. Still my hon. friend knows very well that we can raise all kinds of questions on all these points, including the inevitable communal policy which always turns up from most unexpected quarters and in the most unexpected way. Therefore, I would ask my hon. friends not to attempt at any discussions. Of course if the hon. the Finance Member has any explanations to give, it would be very welcome. I have ventured to make these observations because I see on the faces of the hon. Members a clear evidence of fatigue and any further discussion on these motions may not be quite welcome."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, while I do not for a moment wish to burke any detailed discussion of questions of policy, may I say that it is the other side that has raised a long discussion of the question of Oriya representation in the Government service upon a grant that has nothing to do with the Oriyas? Then, as regards these supplementaries, may I say that what we are trying to get a vote of the House for is for the revised estimate? I recognise that the time allowed has been short, but that is due to the fact that we do not get the final revised estimate till the end of February. As regards the magnitude of the figure involved, as pointed out in paragraph 7 of my memorandum, the Government of India have ordered that the lump sum of Rs. 16.52 lakhs shown under exchange should be distributed over the items to which it relates, which means that we have to ask the Council to vote again nearly the whole of that money, which it has already voted, but in a number of small items under different heads. We have secured again an amount of 4 lakhs on account of unclaimed deposits, but with that goes a liability to the extent of Rs. 1,25,000 for refunding

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[20th March 1923]

Grant I—cont.

those that are subsequently claimed. The amount of 17 lakhs is thus covered by two items which are purely items of account and do not involve one pie of new expenditure."

MR. C. VENKATARANGA REDDI:—"Sir, in some of the Ceded districts famine conditions are prevailing, and there have been a number of petitions for remissions and suspensions. I should like to know what the Government have done on those petitions. If a satisfactory explanation is not forthcoming, I will not be willing to vote for this grant."

MR. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I should like to say a few words on this item of Rs. 3,13,900 under 26-D. Police—Village Police—Village talaiyaris. It is said in this memorandum that

the Board has failed to make as large reductions in the number of talaiyaris during the year as were expected.

I cannot understand, Sir, why reductions have not been possible. Government are trying to effect retrenchments in every possible direction, and if there is to be any cut anywhere at all, the biggest cut should be in regard to this item. In ancient days each village had a talaiyari and a vetti paid by the villagers. They were not doing any communal work, and they had to engage extra talaiyaris and vettis to look after their threshing floors, etc.

The villagers' properties are not in any way guarded in the night by these talaiyaris. They do not go round the villages in the night and prevent the occurrence of thefts, etc. Now, it is nobody's work to look after the villages.

5-45 p.m. "Another thing is that these talaiyaris are neither masters nor servants of anybody. People say that they belong to the Police Department. Some say that they will not obey the karnam or the headman of the village. In some places these talaiyaris obey the orders of the village headmen. They are not of course capable of giving any sort of relevant information to the police about the crimes that are committed in the villages. Whenever a crime is committed it is their duty to report to the village headmen. These people being illiterate are unable to send up such reports and the village headmen also do not want many crimes to be reported. Such being the case, I do not see any use of these talaiyaris at all either to the Government or to the people. For 24,486 villages we have now 32,914 talaiyaris and 32,734 vettis, that is to say roughly three men for each village. Almost all these three men are either the domestic servants of the village headmen or karnams, or are doing tilling work for some of the headmen and some of course doing household work for the karnams. So, their work is altogether very immaterial. I have only one word more to say, Sir. Before the last re-settlement there was only one man for each village. Now there are three people without any work though the villages have not correspondingly expanded. In my opinion the headman of a village should be held responsible for any trouble in his village and the village talaiyaris may be done away with."

The demand was put to the House and passed and the grant was made.

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"May I request, Sir, that the remaining grants may be taken up another day? We are sitting here from 11 to 5-30 and there are a number yet to be moved."

20th March 1923]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I may state that so far as notice is concerned we got the memorandum, etc., only to-day."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I may say that I did everything I could by having the memorandum circulated on Sunday. Hon. Members had thus plenty of time to read the papers."

" As regards taking these grants later, the difficulty is that immediately after the 27th instant we begin the holidays and so far as there is fresh money to be paid out under these grants, it must be paid before the 31st March, and if we cannot get orders out in time to reach distant stations before the 28th, it is no use voting the grants at all. My hon. colleagues and I have another meeting at 5 o'clock to-morrow. So I do not know when we could find time if not now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have no objection to adjourn this to another day if that is the wish of the House. But if we take this to-morrow, it will really be to the prejudice of Budget motions. I am giving the House the full nine days prescribed by His Excellency the Governor for the Budget motions. If we take this to-morrow morning, it will mean that the House will have to sit for an hour or two extra for this purpose."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Our suggestion is that this grant might be postponed till 5 p.m. to-morrow, so that after the Budget motions are over we can take this up."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" May I suggest, Sir, that this may be taken up on the 22nd as the first business for the day?"

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, this might be taken up as the first thing day after to-morrow in which case the objections of Sir Charles Todhunter would be met. His objections are natural and reasonable. He says that the Government must get this sanctioned in time to reach the distant stations before the 28th instant. To-morrow is the 21st and day after to-morrow is the 22nd, and if these grants are voted on that day I think there will be sufficient time for the Government to make the necessary arrangements and they will not be seriously inconvenienced if we have these on the 22nd."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, we do not want to inconvenience the House in any way. So far as the Government are concerned, we have sent copies of these demands to all the departments concerned and I have instructed the heads of departments to wire to-day the result of the discussion. Last year a number of these grants were voted, but the money could not be disbursed before the new year and we had to come forward with fresh supplementary grants in the course of this year and so a great deal of inconvenience was caused. This year we have got the Easter holidays beginning in March and we have no time to lose. I will however accept the opinion of the House."

The question for the adjournment of the further consideration of this grant to 11 a.m. on the 22nd March 1923 was then put to the House and carried.

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.